

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 11-20 have been withdrawn. Claims 5 and 8 have been amended. Claims 5-10 are currently pending in the application.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 5-10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of co-pending Application 09/466,404. The Examiner rejected claims 5-7 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill et al. (Digital Systems: Hardware Organization and Design; hereinafter "Hill"). Such rejections are respectfully traversed.

### Provisional Double Patenting Rejection

A terminal disclaimer has been filed with this amendment, so this rejection is now moot.

### 102(b) Rejection

In order for a reference to anticipate an invention, each and every element of the claimed invention must be found in a single reference. "Moreover, it is incumbent upon the examiner to identify wherein each and every facet of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied reference." Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1462 (Bd Pat App & Inter 1990). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." MPEP § 2131. Applicant respectfully submits that Hill does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention because Hill does not teach or disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.


Amended independent claim 5 recites, in relevant part, "wherein the processor is further configured to provide an address-zero flag that is asserted when the operand address is zero". Hill does not teach or disclose this feature of the claim. Therefore, for at least this reason, Hill does not anticipate Applicant's independent claim 5.

"Claims in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim." 37 CFR 1.75. As discussed above, Hill does not anticipate independent claim 5. Consequently, claims 6-7 are also not anticipated by Hill.

In light of the discussion above, Applicant believes that all claims currently remaining in the application are allowable over the prior art and respectfully requests the allowance of such claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 1, 2004



Nancy R. Simon  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 36,930  
Simon & Koerner LLP  
10052 Pasadena Avenue, Suite B  
Cupertino, California 95014  
direct dial (408) 873-3941; fax (408) 873-3945